## REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, in light of the preceding amendments and following remarks, is respectfully requested. Claims 15-34 are pending in this application. By this Preliminary Amendment, claims 15-16, 24-25 and 33-34 are amended. By this Preliminary Amendment, no claims are added or cancelled.

Because the amendments to claims 15-16, 24-25 and 33-34 present new issues requiring a further search and/or consideration, Applicants have filed this Preliminary Amendment along with an RCE to ensure its consideration. Any subsequent action other than a Notice of Allowance or Quayle Action should be **Non-Final**.

## Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

I. Claims 15-23 and 33-34

The Examiner has rejected claims 15-23 and 33-34 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dawson et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,229,506, hereinafter "Dawson") in view of Kimura (U.S. Publication No. 2004/0080474, hereinafter "Kimura"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for the reasons detailed below.

Initially, Applicants note that the Examiner's reliance on two separate references (e.g., Dawson and Kimura) as disclosing the terminals of the second capacitor is unreasonable and inappropriate. For instance, the Examiner relies upon Dawson as disclosing the "first terminal" of the second capacitor and Kimura as disclosing the "second terminal" of the second capacitor. In other words, the Examiner uses two separate references to illustrate the connection of a **single** capacitor. Applicants submit that this is unreasonable. None-the-less, Applicants have amended the independent claims to further distinguish over the Dawson and Kimura references, as discussed below.

A. Arguments relating to claims 15 and 33 (as well as their dependent claims)

Applicants have amended claim 15 to further recite "the voltage line being set to a value which corresponds to an anode potential of the current driving light emitting element." Support for this amendment is provided at least at page 51 of Applicants' originally filed specification. Applicants submit that neither Kimura nor Dawson discloses a third switching transistor for connecting the second terminal of the second capacitor to a **voltage line**, where the voltage line is set to a **value which corresponds to an anode potential of the current driving light emitting element**, as required by amended claim 15. Rather, the TFT 1807 of FIG. 18A (allegedly corresponding to the third switching transistor) is connected to a **current supply line 1813**. The current supply line 1813 is not the "voltage line" of claim 15 because the current supply line 1813 does **not** correspond to an anode potential of the current driving light emitting element. Rather, the current supply line 1813 is a current supply line which causes the source-gate potential of TFT 1810 to be 0V. Furthermore, for reasons that are apparent, Dawson fails to cure the deficiencies of Kimura. Therefore, Dawson and Kimura, alone or in combination, cannot render claim 15 obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art.

Furthermore, independent claim 33 has been amended to include the same above-recited feature of claim 15, and therefore is patentable for at least the same reasons stated above. Claims 16-23 and 34, dependent on independent claims 1 and 33, are patentable for at least the same reasons stated above, as well as their own merits. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the rejection to claims 15-23 and 33-34 be withdrawn.

B. Arguments relating to dependent claims 16 and 25

In the same period (first period) in claims 16 and 25, the second switching transistor disconnects the second terminal of the second capacitor and the current output terminal of the

driving transistor and the third switching transistor connects the second terminal of the second capacitor to the voltage line, and such connection operation is contrary to that in the second period. In direct contrast, in Kimura, it is very **obvious** that TFT 1818 is turned ON (e.g., Section I) in a **different** period when TFT 1807 is turned OFF (e.g., Section II). Therefore, Kimura cannot possibly disclose the features of claims 16 and 25.

None-the-less, without conceding to the Examiner's position, Applicants have amended claims 16 and 25 to recite, *inter alia*, "the second switching transistor operating in an opposite logic state from the third switching transistor" in an effort to further differentiate Kimura from claims 16 and 25. As discussed in Applicants' previous response, Applicants submit that Kimura does not disclose this feature. For instance, in Kimura, TFT 1818 (allegedly corresponding to the second switching transistor) and TFT 1807 (allegedly corresponding to the third switching transistor) always operate in the **same logic state (or same manner)** during a write period. For example, referring to FIGS. 18A-B and 19A of Kimura, the second, third, and fifth gate signal lines 1803, 1804, and 1816 reach the H level and the fourth gate signal lines 1805 reaches the L level to turn the TFTs **1807**, 1808, 1809 and **1818** ON (Section 1). This generates a current as shown in FIG. 19A to charge the capacitor means 1811.

When storing of the threshold in the capacitor means 1811 is completed, the second and fifth gate signal lines reach the L level and the third gate lines reaches the H level to turn the TFTs **1807**, 1808 and **1818** OFF (section III). See Kimura, paragraph [0149] and [0151].

As a result, TFT 1818 and TFT 1807 always operate in the **same logic state** in direct contrast to the requirements of claims 16 and 25. Therefore, Kimura does not disclose or suggest "the second transistor operating in an opposite logic state from the third transistor" of claims 16 and 25. As admitted by the Examiner, Dawson does not cure the deficiencies of Kimura. Therefore, Kimura and Dawson, alone or in combination, cannot render claims 16 and 25

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request this rejection to claims 16 and 25 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) be withdrawn.

II. Claims 24-32

The Examiner has rejected claims 24-32 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kimura in view of Dawson. Independent claim 24 recites the same above-identified feature of claim 15. For instance, claim 24 recites, *inter alia*, "the voltage line being set to a value which corresponds to an anode potential of the current driving light emitting element." Dawson and Kimura, alone or in combination, does not render claim 24 obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art for the same reasons with respect to claim 15. Claims 25-32, dependent on claim 24, are patentable for at least the same reasons stated above with respect to claim 15.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully request this rejection to claims 24-32 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) be withdrawn.

## CONCLUSION

Accordingly, in view of the above amendments and remarks, reconsideration of the objections and rejections and allowance of the pending claims in connection with the present application is earnestly solicited.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Donald J. Daley at the telephone number of the undersigned below.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 08-0750 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

HARNESS, DICKEY, & PIERCE, P.L.C.

By _____ No. 64,088 for
Donald J. Daley, Reg. No. 34,313

P.O. Box 8910
Reston, Virginia 20195
(703) 668-8000

DJD/JBS:gew